MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY ON JUNE 21, 1937

The 11th meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1937, was held in the office of Mr. John Russell Pope, 542 Fifth Avenue, on Monday, June 21, 1937. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a. m., daylight saving time.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held May 27, 1937, were approved.

2. NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: Mr. Moore read a letter from Mr. A. W. Mellon, with regard to sketches for the National Gallery of Art, as follows:

June 16, 1937.

Dear Mr. Moore:

In compliance with your request, made on behalf of some of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, I have asked Mr. Pope to make sketches illustrating their suggestions regarding certain features of the design for the National Gallery of Art, approved by your Commission on January 30th last.

Mr. Pope has cooperated to the fullest extent and has made comprehensive sketches which have been submitted to me and the other trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust. These sketches are now on view in Mr. Pope's office in New York, where I understand the members of your Commission plan to view them on Monday next. It will be seen that the suggestion as regards a more important interior staircase at the Constitution Avenue entrance to the building has been complied with. With this suggestion, the other trustees and I are in accord, and the staircase will be built as designed.

In accordance with the suggestion that some other central motif be substituted for the dome, Mr. Pope has restudied the approved design and has submitted a sketch in which the dome is eliminated and a pediment is extended north and south through the building. The

resulting composition, from an architectural point of view, seems to illustrate clearly the inadvisability of changing the central portion of the building and does not, in the opinion of the trustees, conform to the requirements of the site set apart by Congress for this Gallery. It appears evident that the Gallery building, without the elevating central motif, will not fulfill its obligations to its location or adjoining buildings on Constitution Avenue.

The trustees also feel that the elimination of the dome constitutes a radical departure from the general plan which was submitted to Congress, with the approval of your Commission, and published in the Press, and that their obligations toward Congress and the public will not be discharged unless the building to be erected conforms in this respect to the design accepted and approved by Congress.

The trustees and the architect have always tried to comply, so far as possible, with all suggestions made by you and wish to be in harmony and cooperate with your Commission. I hope, after examination of the sketches submitted, you will agree that the designs heretofore approved will best meet the requirements of the situation, and that the work on the site, which is now under way, may go forward without further interruption or loss of time in completing this public project.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) A. W. Mellon.

Mr. Moore also read a copy of a letter which Mr. Pope had sent to the trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust (Exhibit A).

The designs were mounted on the walls of the room and were inspected by the members of the Commission. On taking up the discussion of the designs Mr. Shepley said: "We have looked over the two schemes and we are very much impressed with the scheme without the dome; Mr. Pope has made a very beautiful job of it." It was thereupon agreed that Mr. Pope should explain the designs, after which the Commission would have an executive session.

Accordingly Mr. Pope appeared before the Commission in company with Mr. David E. Finley and Mr. Donald Shepard, Attorneys for Mr. Mellon and Trustees of the gallery, as also Mr. Stuart and Mr. Reed, Trustees of the gallery.

Mr. Pope said: "In accordance with Mr. Mellon's request I designed a building without a dome, it being the desire of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts that such sketches be made. The two studies (one with and one without a dome) of elevations and plans are on the walls. The problem has always been tied up with the surroundings and in the 15 or 16 months that we have talked about the subject it has always been my effort to get a building in this location that would have an elevation or motive in the center of it of sufficient height to hold its own with the surrounding buildings, particularly the Capitol, the Archives and the National Museum. These studies had been made previously but this is the final form. I have tried to cover my position in the report I made to the Trustees. It is a concise report and yet comprehensive so that it might answer all the questions that come up."

The Commission considered the two designs for the monumental stairway on the Constitution Avenue side. One scheme emphasizes the stairway with elevators on each side in important positions. The other scheme is just the reverse. The Commission discussed the designs and felt that the rotunda scheme gave much less space for a monumental stairway than the scheme without the dome. Mr. Pope said that while the high portico treatment may be considered the better design he did not think it high enough for the building. Mr. Pope expressed his preference for the design with the dome. He said: "In the design without the dome we have raised the columns as high as possible--50 feet high--it is as high as can be done."

The dome for the National Gallery was compared with the one on the National Museum, which Mr. Pope said is 19 feet higher than the National Gallery dome. Discussion followed as to the question of necessity of putting domes on other new buildings on the Mall if one is permitted on the National

Gallery. Mr. Pope called attention to his remarks on that subject in the letter to the Trustees; he said further, "The Freer Gallery has no dome and no one will design a building with a dome for the squares opposite the Department of Labor Building. Thus a dome on the National Gallery will mean simply two domes on the Mall and not six. The low dome is in accordance with Mr. McKim's plan of 1901, which shows a great many domes on the Mall. The dome was arrived at in February 1936 and shown to the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts in March 1936, at which time it received most favorable approval of all. The design has received the approval of the President and the letter of January 30, 1937, signed by the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, gave us the impression that the design had been approved."

Mr. Moore explained that the letter of January 30 was sent simply to expedite the legislation before Congress. "I said that until Congress has specifically authorized the Commission of Fine Arts to act there has been no official approval of the design. The general design had been discussed from time to time and the Commission had approved a change in location from the one opposite the Labor Department Building to the present site at Third Street."

Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Finley if he had a statement to make. Mr. Finley replied that he and Mr. Shepard had come to the meeting to answer questions; that the letter from Mr. Mellon expresses their views. He was informed that Mr. Moore had read this letter before the Commission. Mr. Shepard then called attention to the hearings before the House Committee on the Library, of which Congressman Keller is Chairman, and said, "I think Congress considers that this building with the dome shall be the building. At least this was incorporated in the report of the Committee. It was the picture submitted to both houses of Congress. Congressman Keller expects that the building will have a dome.

He has sent copies of the hearings, which give a picture of the building with the dome, to all the libraries of the country. We are just a little bit worried. It is a question of a particular building for the site, our responsibility to the site and our responsibility to Congress. Mr. Mellon feels he would be false to Congress if he now builds another type of building; we do not know exactly what position they will take in Congress. I think that if rumor of this gets to the Hill some of the Congressmen may raise a disturbance about it. We have to consider Mr. Pope's services and the whole thing would be delayed."

Mr. Finley said Mr. Mellon has stayed in Washington until the matter is settled, waiting for the steam shovel to begin excavating. He has not been very well and this has been a source of worry. I feel we must reach a definite conclusion today."

Mr. Shepley asked, "Is it a question of competition with the National Museum--the National Museum has a dome, therefore the National Gallery must have a dome?" Mr. Pope explained it is a question of a building in relation to its surroundings. It cannot be a high building with a dome--a one story building. He said that his office has presented the plans as well as possible and has devoted a great deal of night work to them. Mr. Lamb said the presentation is good.

The Commission agreed that the sketches for the monumental staircase were acceptable; that the one showing the stairway in the center with elevators at the side was preferred. It was understood that the stairway on the Constitution Avenue side will be mainly for exit, the main entrance being on the Mall side. Thereupon Mr. Pope and the other gentlemen withdrew and the Commission went into executive session.

Mr. Clarke looked over the testimony made by Mr. Moore before the House Committee on the Library (page 23) and said that in spite of how Mr. Finley and Mr. Shepard interpret the statements of Mr. Moore, the testimony was to the effect that the Commission of Fine Arts could not anticipate the action of Congress and that it was expected the Commission would have matters relating to the design to consider; that Mr. Pope simply did not tell the whole story is clear when he gave the Committee the impression that the design was satisfactory to the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Lamb said, "The setting of the building in its relation to the other buildings on the Mall is the reason I objected to the dome. If the building stood alone, I would say, go ahead and have a dome. I have no prejudices and no personal feelings in so far as domes are concerned, but as I have said before, it is going to have a great deal of influence on the development of the whole Mall."

Mr. Clarke was of the opinion that a frank statement of the views of the Commission of Fine Arts on the subject should be made, that being the duty of the members of the Commission. Mr. Clarke felt the viewpoint of the Commission should be expressed in a resolution. He suggested: "Let us express our views and say that that is the way we feel about it--that we do not approve the dome, but if the trustees insist that the letter of approval of January 30 is law and order to them, then we will rest on that."

Mr. Manship commented on Mr. Moore's testimony in the hearings and said that to him it indicated the Commission of Fine Arts had not fully approved the plans. Mr. Manship felt that the design without the dome was much the better one. Mr. Savage felt likewise.

Thereupon the members of the Commission drew up a resolution. Reference was made to the organic act of the Commission of Fine Arts under which the Commission has only advisory powers. Mr. Moore said that Senator Root drafted the legislation and stressed this phase of the law at the time. Mr. Clarke added that he has always considered it a good thing for the Commission of Fine Arts that it was not given the veto power.

Thereupon the Commission adjourned for luncheon at the Century Club where the Commission decided to meet in the afternoon. However, at the request of Mr. Finley and Mr. Shepard, who asked for a further conference, the Commission returned to Mr. Pope's office in the afternoon.

Mr. Finley said he and Mr. Shepard are very desirous of securing a clear-cut decision from the Commission because he and Mr. Shepard must report to Mr. Mellon that night so that he can determine whether contracts can go ahead tomorrow. Also Mr. Finley said that a few days ago Congressman Keller asked him to come to the Capitol, where Congressman Keller said: "I have heard there has been discussion about the dome and if there is to be any change in the design I want to know about it. I sponsored that measure through Congress as the building to be built and if there is to be any recommendation to change the design I want the opportunity to come to the Commission and talk with the Commission about it." Mr. Finley said that Congressman Keller, thinking that the design had the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts as set forth in Mr. Mellon's letter to the Committee (page 7 of the hearings), went to the trouble to give the National Gallery of Art project the widest publicity and he published the picture showing the building with a dome; and now if the dome is to be taken off he said he would feel like a fool and some of his constituents would laugh about it. Mr. Finley said there is also this consideration--

a building without a dome will cost much less money and it would be to Mr. Mellon's interests if he cared to save money to build the gallery without the dome; but he has committed himself to a building with a dome and he would be criticized if he were not to build the gallery with a dome. Therefore, it seems to me that if you write a letter saying, while you express your preference for a building without a dome, it is realized that in the circumstances the building should be built in accordance with the design submitted to Congress.

Mr. Clarke objected to such a letter, saying that this does not solve the matter for the Commission. He said, "In our judgment we have a clear slate. You predicate everything on the letter of January 30, which Mr. Moore wrote approving the design." Mr. Finley referred to page 23 of the hearings and said there has been no disavowal of the letter of January 30. Mr. Clarke said the letter of January 30 was written to help in the matter of closing Sixth Street. Mr. Finley replied the letter was not needed in connection with closing Sixth Street as everyone, including the Southwest Citizens Association, had agreed to closing the street.

Mr. Clarke thereupon pointed out that the members of the Commission are appointed by the President to serve on the Commission and it is their duty to express an honest opinion. "We went to Mr. Mellon's apartment--we saw cabinet drawings; we asked Mr. Pope questions and he could not answer the questions we placed before him." Mr. Finley said, "To clear the record I want to say that you did not meet in Mr. Mellon's apartment. You met in a suite of rooms in the same building in which Mr. Mellon's apartment is located. Mr. Mellon secured the rooms for this inspection of the plans when he heard from Mr. Moore that it seemed more desirable for the Commission to call on Mr. Mellon than to have the plans considered at the office of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Lamb said that at the meeting of the Commission on January 29th there was a great deal of discussion about the dome and there was criticism concerning the two end pediments and they were eliminated; then

there was discussion of the staircase and also with respect to the exact location of the building on the two squares. Mr. Finley replied, "I don't expect you to say that you like the building or that you don't like it. What we would like is that you express your preference and then say that in the circumstances there is nothing for you to do but to proceed with the plans showing the dome. We have been put on notice by Congressman Keller that he expects us to proceed in accordance with the design submitted to Congress."

Thereupon Mr. Moore said that the Commission had been considering a resolution which would leave Mr. Mellon free to build the gallery with or without a dome, but that the Commission had expressed its preference for the gallery without a dome.

Mr. Finley said this would not be satisfactory. "We cannot place the responsibility on Mr. Mellon. He has not the strength to go through with it. He has expressed his preference for a building with the dome and to omit the dome is to make a radical change in the design." Mr. Finley thereupon again pleaded that in deference to Mr. Mellon's strongly expressed desire that the Commission of Fine Arts authorize him to proceed with the plans for the building showing a dome and to state that the Commission would raise no objection to the Trustees going ahead with the design showing the dome.

Mr. Finley and Mr. Shepard then withdrew and the Commission drafted a reply. The Commission felt that, considering all the circumstances, a concession had to be made but that the Commission should nevertheless make a frank expression of their views in this matter. After thorough consideration the following reply was drafted:

> The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to the plans submitted by the Trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust for a National Gallery of Art designed by Mr. John Russell Pope.

The Commission have conferred with the architect on a number of occasions concerning many details with respect to the design of this building; they find themselves in agreement with him on every matter excepting the treatment of the central motif, in which case they advise a high central portico treatment on the north and south elevations rather than the treatment with a dome.

The Commission approve the plans as submitted, but expressed a strong preference for the scheme (E-6) showing a high central portico. This the Commission believe better adapts itself to the general composition of the Mall, of which this building is an integral part.

However, the Commission are aware that circumstances appear to prevent changes in the design showing a dome, and realize regretfully that it may not be feasible to carry out their suggestions.

A copy of this reply was then shown to Mr. Finley and Mr. Shepard who had some minor suggestions to make but the Commission overruled these. Mr. Finley and Mr. Shepard, after consideration, expressed satisfaction with the statement. The statement was then embodied in the form of a letter addressed to the Trustees of the A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust and signed by the Chairman. (Exhibit A-1)

3. MODEL FOR ADMIRAL BYRD MEDAL: Mr. La Farge, Special Assistant, Treasury Department Art Project, submitted a model of the reverse of the Admiral Byrd Medal with letter as follows:

June 19, 1937.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Under separate cover I am having forwarded to the Commission of Fine Arts, for its comment and advice, the proposed design for the reverse of the medal for the Second Byrd Antarctic Expedition, executed by Mr. Heinz Warneke. This design is in the form of a preliminary plaster model.

A preliminary drawing for this model was shown to the Commission at its last meeting, and an attempt has been made to embody the suggestions of the Commission in the model, which is being presented at this time.

Advice has been received from the Navy Department that the inscription proposed to be used on the medal is an extract from the Congressional Bill which authorized the medal and it was the earnest desire of the officials of the Navy Department and Commander Byrd that the identical wording should be used.

The face of the medal was presented to the Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on May 27, and received its approval, with minor suggestions.

Thanking you for a report on this item, I am

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Henry La Farge
Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects.

Mr. Manship inspected the model. He thought that the sculptor had made the model as good as could be expected from the design and that in some respects he had improved on the design. Upon the recommendation of Mr. Manship the Commission approved the model. (Exhibit B)

4. MEDAL FOR NAVAL EXPEDITIONARY FORCES FOR SERVICE IN FOREIGN LANDS: Mr. La Farge submitted a model made from the sketch for this medal, with letter as follows:

June 19, 1937.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Under separate cover I am having forwarded to the Commission of Fine Arts, for its comment and advice, the proposed design for a medal for the Naval Expeditionary Forces in Foreign Lands. This design is in the form of a preliminary plaster model.

The Commission, at its last meeting on May 27, 1937, considered a rough sketch for this medal in the form of a drawing which, subject to certain minor changes, had been approved by the officials of the Navy Department. Certain changes, however, and an attempt to improve the design, have been made in carrying out the present model. The original design made by Mr. Vincent Glinsky is being carried out by Mr. Antonio Corso. Both these artists are working on the Treasury Department Art Projects.

The dimensions of the medal will be $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches in diameter, which is the regulation size for a medal.

Thanking you for a report on this item, I am

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Henry La Farge,
Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects.

The Commission compared the model with the sketch which was considered at the meeting on May 27. Mr. Manship thought both model and sketch were confused. The Commission realized, however, that the design was to portray a group of men rather than a single person and in the circumstances approved the model. (Exhibit C)

5. PAINTINGS FOR INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Mr. Rowan, Superintendent of the Section of Painting and Sculpture, Treasury Department, submitted the following letter regarding a painting for the Interior Department Building:

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am having submitted herewith the winning design, by Mr. Louis Bouche, submitted in the National competition for the mural decoration of the Auditorium in the New Department of the Interior Building.

The members of the jury who were unanimous in their selection of this design were: Mr. Waddy Wood, architect of the Interior Building; William Zimmerman of the Department of the Interior; Eugene Savage, mural painter, New York City; Alexander Brook and Hermon More, painters, and Daniel Catton Rich, Assistant Director of the Art Institute of Chicago.

The Secretary of the Interior has requested that certain revisions be made in the design but I would appreciate at this time the comments and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts on the work. The design, following your reviewing of it, should be left in the office of Mr. Russell Pope so that the artist may collect it rather than forwarding it to this office.

Thanking you for your courtesy in this matter and wishing you and the members of the Commission a pleasant summer, I am

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture.

Mr. Bouche was present and submitted photographs of the painting. Mr. Savage reported that he was a member of the jury that had selected the painting. The painting is to be back of the stage of the auditorium in the new Interior Department Building; it is to be in the form of a triptych and is to portray scenes of western life.

Upon the recommendation of Mr. Savage the Commission gave its general approval to the sketch with the understanding that Mr. Savage will advise the artist as to details. Mr. Savage was in conference with Mr. Bouche about the matter. A report was sent to Mr. Rowan. (Exhibit D)

6. PAINTING FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BUILDING: Under date of June 19, 1937, the following letter was received from Mr. Henry La Farge concerning the design for a mural painting in the Department of Labor Building:

June 19, 1937.

Dear Mr. Moore:

Under separate cover I am having forwarded to the Commission of Fine Arts, for its comment and advice, the proposed design for mural decorations in the Executives' Dining Room of the Department of Labor Building in Washington, D. C.

The room is situated in the basement of the building (Room 219) and is used exclusively by the executives of the Department and their guests. Murals were requested for this room by the Secretary of Labor, and other officials of the Department.

A color sketch for each end wall is shown--one at a 1-inch scale, the other at a 2-inch scale. The general treatment, as suggested by officials of the Labor Department, is in the form of a decorative landscape, relating in some way to various phases of modern industry and labor.

These designs are being executed by Charles Trumbo Henry, an artist working under the Treasury Department Art Projects.

Thanking you for a report on this item, I am

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Henry La Farge, Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects.

The sketches were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Savage, who inspected them and approved them in principle. Mr. Savage made certain criticisms which were embodied in a report to Mr. La Farge. (Exhibit E)

7. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: Mr. Clarke reported that on Monday, May 28, he met with the committee from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in the office of Mr. William Adams Delano, New York City, to consider a location plan for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial and that the committee decided that if the south axis location is chosen a landscape plan should be prepared showing street extensions, changes in the contour of the Tidal Basin, etc.

It was also agreed that the memorial should be on the axis of 16th Street but need not necessarily be on the axis of Maryland Avenue; that the memorial might be on an informal island, the composition, however, to be harmonious with the Washington Monument Grounds. Mr. Clarke said that a report was sent to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. This is as far as the matter has gone. Mr. Clarke added that he thought this a safe consideration of the problem. The Commission were pleased with Mr. Clarke's report.

(The official report on the subject was received from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and approved by Mr. Clarke. (Exhibit F))

8. NATIONAL AUDITORIUM: Mr. Moore reported that he has been meeting with the Advisory Committee of the National Auditorium Commission and that of the several locations suggested for the auditorium the preferred sites are now two in number. One is the Municipal Center site at Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue and the other at the end of East Capitol Street.

The question was raised as to who would design the building and the Secretary stated that Mr. Simon, the Supervising Architect, has been asked by

the Advisory Committee to make preliminary sketches. The Commission felt that an architect experienced in designing an auditorium should be chosen for this work.

9. NAVY AND MARINE MEMORIAL: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission H. J. Res. 403 by means of which the Navy and Marine Memorial Association proposes to get an additional appropriation of $189,634 to complete the memorial. Mr. Moore stated that he had conferred with sculptors about this memorial and that they have said that the memorial does not justify the additional appropriation. The Commission agreed with Mr. Moore in this matter. Mr. Moore further suggested that the National Park Service should ask for an accounting of the funds expended by the Association. A letter was accordingly sent to the Director of the National Park Service. (Exhibit G)

10. STATUES NEAR ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Under date of June 17, 1937, Mr. McIntyre, Secretary to the President, transmitted the following memorandum which he had received from Hon. Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce:

June 15, 1937.

Memorandum for: Colonel Marvin H. McIntyre,
Assistant Secretary to the President.

From: Secretary of Commerce.

In accordance with our practice, I am sending to you the following memoranda and supporting data touching matters which I hope you may have early opportunity to bring to the attention of the President.

1. Dr. James Brown Scott, Secretary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, born in Canada, has for some time been manifesting to me very keen interest in Robert E. Lee. I suggested to him some days ago in conversation that he write me a letter giving his views as to what might properly be done toward fostering good will and I might bring it to the attention of the President.

He has submitted the following:

On the District side of the Potomac, between Lincoln Memorial and the bridge, place bronze statues of Jefferson and Hamilton, one of the South and one of the North.

Across the bridge on the Virginia side, place bronze statues of two great Commanders-in-Chief, Robert E. Lee and Ulysses S. Grant, one of the South and one of the North.

He says in this connection: "The names of these highminded gentlemen, statesmen and soldiers, are enough without further comment, other than to say that their statues so placed would be the outward and visible sign that we are once again and forever a united people".

I shall be glad to know the President's attitude toward this matter and any suggestion he may wish to give me as to how I can be useful in carrying out what would seem to me to be quite a worth while suggestion.

2. Your attention is called to the correspondence of Mr. H. H. Whiting, of San Francisco, California, member of our Business Advisory Council, with the League for Supreme Court Independence, Inc. I am glad that a member of our Business Advisory Council is taking this position.

Probably you might be willing to drop Whiting a note.

D. C. R.

Mr. Moore said that Dr. Scott's suggestion deserved consideration but that it seems impracticable to carry out his suggestion; Mr. Friedlander's statues are designed for the entrance to the Memorial Bridge; Mr. Weinman is designing a statue for the great entrance on the Virginia side. Mr. Moore also said there is a statue of Alexander Hamilton on the south steps of the Treasury and a statue of General Grant at the head of the Mall. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial is now under consideration. Mr. Moore added that this leaves the question of a statue of General Lee and it would be possible to place it at the entrance of the Lee Highway but this is a matter for Congress to decide. The Commission, after discussion, agreed with Mr. Moore in this matter and a report was sent to Mr. McIntyre accordingly. (Exhibit H)

11. SPANISH WAR MEMORIAL: The secretary reported that the Director of the National Park Service desires the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to an Act of Congress approved August 20, 1935, "to provide for the creation of a memorial park at Tampa, in the State of Florida, to be known as 'The Spanish War Memorial Park' and for other purposes." (Exhibit I)

The secretary said that the park comprises 43 acres and thus far the legislature of Florida has appropriated $100,000 for the memorial and an additional $400,000 is to be secured from P. W. A. funds. There is to be a memorial building.

The Commission considered the matter. It was decided that the National Park Service should appoint an architectural adviser to give advice as to the project and that a collaborative competition should be held in which architect, sculptor, painter and landscape architect would participate. The Commission felt it would be unwise to hold a nation-wide competition but that from five to seven architects might be desirable in a competition if all were paid for their work, such list of architects to be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts by the architectural adviser for approval. Also it is understood that the competition would be held under the rules of the American Institute of Architects. A number of prominent architects were named, among whom one might be secured to serve as an architectural adviser. Among these were Mr. Swartwout, Mr. Howells, Mr. Emerson, Dr. Cret and Mr. Le Baum. After consideration it was decided to recommend Mr. Swartwout as the architectural adviser. A report was sent to the Director of the National Park Service. (Exhibit I-1)

12. STATUARY FOR APEX BUILDING: Mr. Manship reported that the Section of Painting and Sculpture has designated certain sculptors to make models for the sculpture of the Apex Building, which is being constructed under the supervision of the Office of the Supervising Architect. Mr. Manship raised the question

whether he should advise these sculptors as to their models.

Mr. Moore pointed out that the Apex Building has a very prominent location on Pennsylvania Avenue and the sculpture for it is a matter of great importance. Mr. Moore said there would appear to be no objection to Mr. Manship advising the sculptors but that it would be desirable to bring the sketches to the attention of the entire Commission as soon as possible. The Commission concurred with Mr. Moore in this matter.

13. LOCATION OF NAVAL HOSPITAL: The secretary reported that he had heard that the President has expressed his endorsement of a plan to relocate the Naval Hospital, for which a bill has been introduced in Congress (H. R. 6547). (Exhibit J) It was noted from the bill that it proposes to amend a previous act for enlarging the Naval Hospital in which there is a provision that the Commission of Fine Arts shall advise as to the design, as follows:

> CHAP. 301 An Act To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with certain public works at the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia.
>
> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to replace, remodel, or extend existing structures and to construct additional buildings, with the utilities, accessories, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, at the United States Naval Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, at a cost not to exceed $3,200,000, of which $100,000 shall be charged to the Naval Hospital fund: Provided, that the construction herein authorized shall be subject to the approval of the Public Building Commission under the authority of section 6 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, to the same extent as other public building construction in the District of Columbia, and the plans for such construction shall be submitted to the Fine Arts Commission for advice.
>
> SEC. 2 The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to employ, when deemed by him desirable or advantageous, by contract or otherwise, outside professional or technical services of persons, firms, or corporations, to such extent as he may require for the purposes of this Act, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, or to

section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in addition to employees otherwise authorized and expenditures for such purposes shall be made from the Naval Hospital fund.

Approved, February 25, 1931.

46 Stat. Page 1419.

The Commission expressed their interest in this matter. The secretary reported that he had heard there are several officials in Washington who would like to see the Naval Hospital built on the Virginia side along the Lee Highway. The Commission expressed interest in this matter and agreed that the Naval Hospital should be relocated.

14. HONORARY DEGREE FOR THE CHAIRMAN: The Commission congratulated Mr. Moore on the recognition to be given him by Harvard University at this year's Commencement on June 24th, in bestowing upon him the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Arts, for his years of service to promote the orderly development of the National Capital.

The Commission adjourned at 6:30 p. m.

COPY

OFFICE OF JOHN RUSSELL POPE
NEW YORK

June 11th, 1937

Trustees of The A. W. Mellon
Educational and Charitable Trust,
730 Fifteenth Street,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with your request for sketches illustrating suggestions made by members of the Commission of Fine Arts regarding certain features of the approved design of the National Gallery of Art, I am sending you the accompanying drawings of a modification of such design in which the dome is omitted and submitting my observations thereon.

This new design has, as a central motif, a pediment extending north and south through the building. Externally the resulting composition conforms with the best of our Washington classical traditions. Internally the necessary use of a rectangle form in place of the Rotunda repeats the forms of the two terminal court motifs and results in a plan not as varied or interesting as that of the Rotunda scheme.

The new design has not affected the gallery arrangement, its flexibility, lighting or other features of the approved Rotunda design. The question of a dome on the building might therefore resolve itself into a matter of taste were it not for the existence of other and important conditions to be considered having to do with the particular site set aside by Congress for the building.

Drawings Nos. 4 and 11 show, as seen from the Mall, the proposed National Gallery with and without a dome, in relation to the National Museum, the cross axis of the Mall and the Archives Building on this axis.

From these drawings it appears evident that the National Gallery without an elevating central motif will not hold its own with the National Museum, balance it as it should, nor fulfill its obligations to its location or adjoining buildings on Constitution Avenue, which are also shown on these drawings. On the other hand, I think it does appear evident that the dome, although 19 feet lower than that on the National Museum and of a more integral part of the design of the building, has added the power interest and dignity to fulfill these obligations. I therefore, for this and other reasons, recommend the dome design over the pedimented design.

COPY

OFFICE OF JOHN RUSSELL POPE
NEW YORK

Trustees of The A. W. Mellon
Educational and Charitable Trust

June 11, 1937

There have been statements made to the effect that a dome on the Gallery would involve the necessity of domes on future buildings in the Mall.

On this point reference to plan No. 14 should be helpful. This plan shows that the Freer Gallery will prevent a building corresponding to the National Museum opposite it on the south side of the Mall. A dome in this location will therefore be uncalled for. If building symmetry be adhered to with respect to the cross axis of the Mall on the south side as on the north side of the Mall no dome will be desirable opposite the National Gallery. In other words, a dome on the National Gallery to balance that on the National Museum means two domes on the Mall and not six, as has been suggested.

This conclusion is supported by information I received first hand from the creators of the Plan of 1901 as to the architectural motifs that were anticipated to be used in the fulfillment of this plan. I can assure the Trustees that the low dome was one of these and that, in this instance, is a logical practical means of securing height and dignity in the design that no other motif can furnish. I strongly recommend its use.

The dome design was arrived at in February, 1936, having been developed and submitted to the Trustees in March, 1936, and shown to the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts on March 12th of that year, in line with Mr. Mellon's proposal to build, with the permission and approval of the Congress, a building for the National Gallery of Art, on the site thereafter authorized by Congress. At that time it received most favorable approval of all as being a satisfactory design for a National Gallery on the proposed site. In view of my great interest in the development and beautification of Washington, I, of course, directed my study and efforts towards a design which would be in keeping with Washington's classical traditions as well as fulfill its obligations to its location and adjoining buildings on Constitution Avenue. The design was conceived and renderings made with this in mind and also with the idea that the design would have to be approved, not only by the Trustees, but also by the Commission of Fine Arts and be acceptable to the appropriate committees of Congress before permission could be secured to erect the building. The design has since been refined and developed and has received the approval of the President, and on January 30, 1937, the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts. The design so approved was submitted

COPY

OFFICE OF JOHN RUSSELL POPE
NEW YORK

Trustees of The A. W. Mellon
Educational and Charitable Trust

June 11, 1937

to the Committee on the Library of the House of Representatives and the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts testified at the hearings before these Committees that the plans in general had been approved by his Commission.

It should be noted in the latest revisions of the dome design submitted herewith that the informal recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts, including the new end facades, changes in elevator and stair arrangement, etc., have been complied with.

Trusting that you will find the material submitted useful to the Trustees, I am

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) John Russell Pope,

JRP:LF

C O P Y

New York City,

June 21, 1937.

Trustees of the A. W. Mellon
Educational and Charitable Trust,
730 Fifteenth Street,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts have given careful consideration to the plans submitted by the Trustees of The A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust for a National Gallery of Art designed by Mr. John Russell Pope.

The Commission have conferred with the architect on a number of occasions concerning many details with respect to the design of this building; they find themselves in agreement with him on every matter excepting the treatment of the central motif, in which case they advise a high central portico treatment on the north and south elevations rather than the treatment with a dome.

The Commission approve the plans as submitted, but express a strong preference for the scheme (E-6) showing a high central portico. This the Commission believe better adapts itself to the general composition of the Mall, of which this building is an integral part.

However, the Commission are aware that circumstances appear to prevent changes in the design showing a dome and realize regretfully that it may not be feasible to carry out their suggestions.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT A-1

C O P Y

June 22, 1937.

Dear Mr. La Farge:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York City on June 21, 1937, considered the model which you submitted for the reverse of the medal to commemorate Admiral Byrd's Second Antarctic Expedition.

The model was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission; upon his recommendation the Commission approved the model.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Henry La Farge,
Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

June 22, 1937.

Dear Mr. La Farge:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York City on June 21, 1937, considered the model which you submitted for a medal to commemorate the Naval Expeditionary Forces in foreign lands. The model received the particular attention of Mr. Paul Manship, sculptor member of the Commission. The Commission approved the model.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Henry La Farge,
Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

June 22, 1937.

Dear Mr. Rowan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York City on June 21, 1937, considered the design by Mr. Louis Bouche for the mural decoration of the auditorium in the new Interior Department Building. The Commission approve the design, generally.

Mr. Eugene Savage, the painter member of the Commission, was in conference with Mr. Bouche with regard to certain details of the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Edward B. Rowan,
Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

June 26, 1937.

Dear Mr. La Farge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 21, 1937, had under consideration the designs you submitted with your letter of June 19th, for mural decorations in the Executives' Dining Room of the Department of Labor Building, by Charles Trumbo Henry.

The sketches were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Eugene Savage, painter member of the Commission, for comment. The sketches are approved in principle. Mr. Savage makes the following criticisms:

> The human figures in the sketches were measured as being six to seven inches. In a room about twenty feet long they are too small to be read as figures and I suggest that they be made as large again. The end composition opposite the door disturbingly divides itself into three equal divisions. Most of the pattern in general is characterized by a wiry and scratchy linear net work; while this is part of the artist's rather engaging artlessness, it should be relieved here and there by some forms.

The Commission of Fine Arts concur in these criticisms by Mr. Savage.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. Henry La Farge,
Special Assistant,
Treasury Department Art Projects,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

THE COMPANY WILL APPRECIATE SUGGESTIONS FROM ITS PATRONS CONCERNING ITS SERVICE

1201-S

CLASS OF SERVICE

This is a full-rate Telegram or Cablegram unless its deferred character is indicated by a suitable symbol above or preceding the address.

WESTERN UNION

(103).

R. B. WHITE
PRESIDENT

NEWCOMB CARLTON
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

J. C. WILLEVER
FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

SYMBOLS

DL = Day Letter
NM = Night Message
NL = Night Letter
LC = Deferred Cable
NLT = Cable Night Letter
Ship Radiogram

The filing time shown in the date line on telegrams and day letters is STANDARD TIME at point of origin. Time of receipt is STANDARD TIME at point of destination.

Received at 708 14th St., N. W. Washington, D. C.

WE13 22 GOVT COLLECT=TU NEWYORK NY 2 849A

H P CAEMMERER, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS=

SOUTH INTERIOR BLDG:

=REPORT OF PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION CONCERNING JEFFERSON MEMORIAL MEETS WITH MY APPROVAL STOP SUGGEST COPIES BE SENT MEMBERS OF COMMISSION=

GILMORE D CLARKE.

NO ADDITIONAL CHARGE IS MADE FOR REQUESTING A REPLY BY WESTERN UNION

Frederic A. Delano,
Chairman.

Incl.-Report

Exhibit F.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Interior
BUILDING,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

June 25, 1937.

Dr. Charles Moore,
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
New Interior Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Dr. Moore:

You will recall that on April 9, 1937, the Commission supplied you with copy of "Report and Letter of Transmittal of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to the Jefferson Memorial Commission".

The Commission, at its May meeting, appointed a Subcommittee to make further studies of this matter. The Subcommittee's report was received, revised and adopted at the meeting of the Commission on June 19. I am enclosing for the benefit of you and your Commission a copy of this report. You are perhaps aware that Major Gilmore Clarke of the Commission of Fine Arts, sat in conference with our committee.

Very truly yours,

Frederic A. Delano

Frederic A. Delano,
Chairman.

Incl.-Report

Exhibit F.

Report of the
NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK & PLANNING COMMISSION
on the
Proposed Memorial to Thomas Jefferson
Supplementing its Report of April 9, 1937.

June 19, 1937.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission has further considered the proposal to erect a memorial to Thomas Jefferson in the Tidal Basin area, and records its conclusions as follows:

The Commission believes that a site on the north and south axis of the White House, and somewhere near the point where the axis of Maryland Avenue crosses, is an appropriate site for a commemorative monument to Thomas Jefferson, for the following reasons:

1st. Because a monument erected on this site would complete the north and south axis through the White House, by creating a spot for the eye to rest upon, and, if properly backed by planting on the south, cut out the unsightly railroad and traffic bridges across the Potomac.

2nd. Because as a site, it is of importance comparable with the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial and we believe that, historically, Thomas Jefferson deserves such a position.

But it cannot be determined as the most fitting site without knowing definitely that the practical requirements of the City and the architectural composition of the Mall area can be satisfactorily solved. The practical requirements are these: that the Tidal Basin function efficiently; that the immense flow of vehicular traffic over the bridge from Virginia (now nearly thirty thousand cars a day) can be adequately carried in and out of the City; and that easy routes for motors through Potomac Park can be provided for recreation. The esthetic requirement

is that whatever structure is put on this site, the approaches to it and the entire area of which it is a part should bear a proper and appropriate relation to the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and the White House.

There are two methods of treating this Memorial, its setting and the approaches to it - one rigidly formal, the other informal. The first was the scheme proposed by the McMillan Commission in 1901, and is, in many essentials, the plan now submitted by the Jefferson Memorial Commission. The second has not been given the careful study by the Memorial Commission that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission believes it deserves. Conditions have materially changed since the Plan of 1901 was created: the Tidal Basin and Potomac Park are now regarded as being almost sacred by the citizens of Washington and its visitors; it has now been determined that no sufficiently formal design can be carried out without underpinning the Washington Monument; the Lincoln Memorial has been created and has given definite formal stamp to the Mall from the Capitol to the Potomac. The Commission believes, therefore, that the same rigid formality - even if it could be carried out practically on the north and south cross axis - would not be a gain, because it would detract from the formal dignity of the main east and west axis.

If the grandiose scheme for the Memorial and the steps leading up to it, which is now proposed by the Jefferson Memorial Commission, should be accepted by Congress, Congress should realize that it implies a total revamping of the Tidal Basin with a great diminution of the area of West Potomac Park, and a rigid formalization of the so-called Washing-

ton Monument Grounds, which would require the underpinning of the Washington Monument. Even if the engineers say that in its altered state the Tidal Basin would function equally well, that the Washington Monument could be underpinned and the Washington Monument grounds formalized without jeopardy to the Monument itself, and that the flow of traffic in Potomac Park across the Virginia bridge, can be adequately handled - this Commission still believes that the Memorial proposed is too grandiose, too much of a repetition of the thought - if not the form - of the Lincoln Memorial, and that something less pretentious and more in the freer classical spirit of the White House and Capitol architecture would better characterize Jefferson.

To summarize: The National Capital Park and Planning Commission believes that before the site or memorial is approved or condemned, the Jefferson Memorial Commission should have studies made for a more informal scheme along the lines of the appended suggestive sketch. Such a scheme offers the following advantages:

1. It creates a cross axis beginning at the White House and terminating at the Memorial itself, which is no less real because it is not treated with rigid formality.

2. It makes it possible with study to leave the Tidal Basin with the best of the cherry trees substantially intact, and offers an unimpeded view of the proposed Memorial from the shores of the Tidal Basin.

3. It allows more freedom in planning for the approaches to the Virginia bridge and for handling the traffic in Potomac Park.

4. It implies a less formal rectangular treatment of the Washington Monument Grounds.

5. Finally - though this should be in no way a controlling consideration - it calls for a far smaller expenditure to complete the design as a whole.

PLAN OF CENTRAL AREA

SUGGESTED SKETCH FOR LOCATION OF

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO

THOMAS JEFFERSON

SCALE 1"=600'

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK & PLANNING COMMISSION

TO ACCOMPANY REPORT OF

JUNE 19, 1937

C O P Y

June 21, 1937.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

My attention has been called to H. J. Res. 403, "To Provide for the Completion of the Navy and Marine Memorial", which I note has been referred to the Committee on the Library. Also the bill provides that the memorial shall be "in accordance with the official plans therefor as approved by the Fine Arts Commission".

At the time that funds were raised for the Navy and Marine Memorial by the Navy and Marine Memorial Association--more than 10 years ago--it was understood that the sum of $350,000 would be sufficient for the memorial. The bill states: "The American people as above described have already contributed by donations the sum of $340,000". This sum should have been sufficient for the casting of the monument and completing the pedestal yet it is noted from the bill that an additional $189,634 is requested from the Government. In the opinion of certain leading sculptors with whom I have conferred in regard to this matter, the completed monument altogether should have cost less than $150,000.

I suggest that you request the House Committee on the Library that they demand an accounting of the money raised and spent by the association and also a list of debts and estimates for completion before the bill is approved. Unofficially I have heard the sculptor wants a payment of $100,000, which is an exorbitant claim for his services. The design is mediocre in character and is not considered a contribution to the art of the National Capital.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

June 28, 1937.

Dear Mr. McIntyre:

The Commission of Fine Arts acknowledge the receipt of suggestions made by Dr. James Brown Scott, of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and forwarded to the President by Secretary of Commerce Roper. Dr. Scott proposes that in furtherance of a spirit of amity between the North and the South statues of Jefferson and Hamilton be placed near the Washington end of the Arlington Memorial Bridge and statues of General Grant and General Lee be placed at the Virginia end.

Any suggestions coming from so distinguished a scholar and publicist as Dr. Scott deserve consideration. It seems to this Commission, however, that he may not have considered fully existing conditions and all the implications which the realization of his suggestions would involve. Among these may be listed the following:

First. Already there is on the south front of the Treasury an appropriately located statue of Hamilton, which has taken rank among the best portrait statues in this country. It is not probable that this statue could be excelled either as a work of art or in popular favor.

Second. Congress has undertaken to create a memorial to Thomas Jefferson in a highly significant location and of a dignity worthy of the fame of that statesman.

EXHIBIT H

Third. There are no suitable locations for any statues between the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Memorial Bridge. Moreover, such statues if there located would be dominated by the Lincoln Memorial; and the historic significance would be lost. The memorial to Ericsson, designer of the Monitor, located on the south axis of the Lincoln Memorial, indicates the historical type of subordinate monument suited to that area. The circle at the north axis awaits appropriate development.

Fourth. A monument to General Grant at the head of the Mall, is of such importance that no other memorial to Grant in Washington could be expected to equal it in location or in importance as a work of art.

Fifth. Dr. Scott's suggestion of a statue to General Lee remains for consideration. This belongs in the category of subjects which Congress reserves for primary consideration, location and artistic merit being reserved for the advice of this Commission after Congress has acted on the basic considerations and fixed the limits of the appropriation.

This report of the Commission of Fine Arts on Dr. Scott's proposals is made with entire sympathy with the ends he seeks. It is furnished under the requirement of the organic act requiring the Commission to give advice to the President on request.

Very respectfully,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. Marvin H. McIntyre,
Assistant Secretary
to the President,
The White House.

[PUBLIC—NO. 287—74TH CONGRESS]

[S. 2426]

AN ACT

To provide for the creation of a memorial park at Tampa, in the State of Florida, to be known as "The Spanish War Memorial Park", and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That when title to such lands located on Davis Island in the city of Tampa, Florida, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said area shall be set apart as The Spanish War Memorial Park, for the benefit and inspiration of the people: *Provided*, That said lands shall be donated without cost to the United States by the city of Tampa, Florida, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept such conveyance of lands.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be located and constructed within said memorial park a suitable monument or memorial to commemorate the patriotic services of the American forces in the War with Spain. The cost of establishing such monument or memorial, of constructing suitable side walks and approaches, and of landscaping such site, may be paid from any fund or moneys available for such purpose, except from the general fund of the Treasury; and the Secretary is for that purpose further authorized and empowered to determine upon a suitable location, plan, and design for said monument or memorial, by and with the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 3. In the discharge of his duties hereunder, the Secretary of the Interior, through the National Park Service, is authorized to employ, in his discretion, by contract or otherwise, landscape architects, architects, artists, engineers, and/or other expert consultants in accordance with the usual customs of the several professions without reference to civil-service requirements or to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and that expenditures for such employment shall be construed to be included in any appropriations hereafter authorized for any work under the objectives of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized, by and with the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts, to authorize and permit the erection in said memorial park of suitable memorials in harmony with the monument and/or memorial herein authorized that may be desired to be constructed by Spanish War organizations, States, and/or foreign governments: *Provided*, That the design and location of such memorials must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, by and with the advice of the National Commission of Fine Arts, before construction is undertaken.

SEC. 5. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid Spanish War Memorial Park, including any and all memorials that may hereafter be erected thereon, shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service.

Approved, August 20, 1935.

EXHIBIT I

C O P Y

June 28, 1937.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on June 21, 1937, had under consideration Public No. 287, 74th Congress, approved August 20, 1935, an Act "To provide for the creation of a memorial park at Tampa, in the State of Florida, to be known as "The Spanish War Memorial Park", and for other purposes. The Commission respectfully advise the National Park Service that the most satisfactory method of selecting an architect or architects to design the Spanish War Memorial at Tampa is the one that after experience the American Institute of Architects has found to produce the best results. It is fair to the Government which stands in relation of client. It is fair to the artists involved. It is capable of producing the best results when followed in entire good faith on all sides.

First. The officials charged with carrying out the project should select and appoint an Architectural Adviser, to discuss with them the entire project and reach an agreement as to scope, nature and costs. These points having been settled, the Architectural Adviser will prepare a program of competition, giving in detail such information as the architects must have in order to understand the problem with which they are to deal. It is important that the program include the names of the jurors. The competence and fairness of the jury is an element of first consideration by competitors.

This Commission ventures to suggest that Mr. Egerton Swartwout, of New York City, be selected as Architectural Adviser. As architect of the Missouri State Capitol and of the Elks Temple in Chicago, he is familiar with the mutual relations among architects, landscape architects, sculptors and painters. As long chairman of the American Institute of Architects Committee on Competitions he knows the way to secure simple, expeditious and satisfactory results. His professional work and reputation are of the highest. Both time and money are saved by securing at the beginning a capable and experienced architectural adviser.

If an architect shall be selected directly, without the intervention of a competition, as is done on occasion, very careful preliminary study of the whole project will still be necessary.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT I-1

Union Calendar No. 369

75TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6547

[Report No. 1039]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 21, 1937

Mr. VINSON of Georgia introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed

JUNE 17, 1937

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act approved February 25, 1931 (46 Stat. 1419), be and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to construct in the District of Columbia, or in the immediate vicinity thereof, on land already acquired or hereby authorized to be acquired therefor by purchase, gift, or otherwise, buildings to replace the present Naval Hospital and Naval Medical School at Washington, District of Columbia, with

the utilities, accessories, and appurtenances pertaining thereto, including facilities for the Naval Medical Center and Naval Dental School: *Provided,* That the *advice of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission be requested before the acquisition of property for this purpose and before the construction herein authorized shall begin; if located in the District of Columbia, the construction herein authorized be subject to the approval of the National Park Service under authority of section 6 of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended (U. S. C., title 40, sec. 346): Provided further, That the* total cost of the land and of the construction hereby authorized shall not exceed $4,850,000, *of which not more than 15 per centum may be expended for the purchase of the site.*

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the United States, free from encumbrances and without cost to the United States, the title in fee simple to any land which may be acquired by gift."

Union Calendar No. 369

75TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6547

[Report No. 1039]

A BILL

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia

APRIL 21, 1937

Referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed

JUNE 17, 1937

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed